DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 427 HE 010 243

AUTHOR Jones, Phillip E., Ed.
TITLE Historical Perspectives on the Development of Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. Six Addresses Delivered at the University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.
INSTITUTION American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.
REPORT NO ACT-SR-22
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM ACT Publications, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Achievement Tests; *Black Education; Black Students; Educational Finance; *Educational History; Educational Opportunities; *Equal Education; *Higher Education; Intelligence Tests; Low Income Groups; *Minority Groups; Speeches

ABSTRACT

A historical perspective on several issues related to the development of equal opportunity in higher education is presented in these speeches. Six authors address the following issues: (1) the black college in historical perspective (Stephen Wright); (2) the development of equal opportunity in relation to historical patterns in higher education (Elias Blake, jr.); (3) a historical account of testing as it relates to equal opportunity (William Turnbull); (4) financing postsecondary education for EOP students (Fred P. Hargleroad); (5) future considerations on the development of educational opportunity programs (Willard L. Boyd); and (6) a historical model for evaluating equal opportunity programs (Hugh W. Lane). The speakers come from the American College Testing Program, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Institute for Services to Education, the Educational Testing Service, the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, and the University of Iowa. (Author/LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157427

ACT SPECIAL REPORT TWENTY-TWO

Historical Perspectives on the Development of Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

Six Addresses Delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74

Edited by Phillip E. Jones

Contributors: Stephen Wright
Elias Blake, Jr.
William Turnbull
Fred F. Harcleroad
Willard L. Boyd
Hugh W. Lane

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The American College Testing Program

HE010243

The American College Testing Program (ACT) is dedicated to the enrichment of education. It was founded as a public trust and operates as a nonprofit corporation governed by elected educational representatives from individual states or regions, and by a Board of Trustees.

A fundamental goal of ACT is to exercise educational leadership through guidance-oriented assessment and research services in order to (1) assist in the identification and solution of educational problems and (2) communicate to the general and professional publics knowledge and ideas about education.

The chief beneficiaries of ACT's services are students, secondary schools, institutions of postsecondary education, and educational researchers.

ACT, a nonprofit organization, is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 77-94842

© 1978 by The American College Testing Program
All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America

For additional copies write:
ACT Publications
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Price $2.00 (Check or money order must accompany request.)

Dedication

Dedicated to the memory
of Hugh W. Lane (February 21, 1926-October 27, 1976)
for his contributions to the cause of
equal opportunity in higher education.

Contents

Foreword vii

Introduction

Phillip E. Jones 1

The Black College in Historical Perspective

Stephen Wright 3

The Development of Equal Opportunity in Relation to Historical Patterns in Higher Education

Elias Blake, Jr. 11

A Historical Account of Testing As It Relates to Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

William Turnbull 17

Financing Postsecondary Education for EOP Students

Fred F. Harcleroad 23

Future Considerations on the Development of Educational Opportunity Programs

Willard L. Boyd 27

A Historical Model for Evaluating Equal Opportunity Programs

Hugh W. Lane 31

Foreword

Since its founding in 1959, the primary goal of The American College Testing Program (ACT) has been to assist students and institutions at the transition point between high school and college, thereby increasing the likelihood of a successful college experience. For the past decade, particular emphasis has been placed on assuring culturally different students an equal opportunity for higher education. Toward this end, ACT has supported a variety of projects to broaden the educational experience of disadvantaged youth. In addition, ACT's programs and services have been designed to help students communicate their individual educational needs to institutions and agencies. All materials and procedures are continuously scrutinized to avoid any inequity or bias.

ACT's concern for equal opportunity in higher education has also resulted in a variety of publications. Most of these have contained the results of research based on data from ACT programs and services. Other publications, such as *The Ghetto College Student*, have been written from other perspectives. The present publication places the development of equal opportunity in higher education in a historical framework. This is particularly helpful in an era of "instant history." Although formal programs to assist minorities in colleges and universities are relatively recent, efforts to provide educational opportunities for Blacks have their roots deep in America's past.

Through this publication, it is ACT's hope that there will be an increased understanding and appreciation of the historical development, present status, and continuing issues related to the provision of equal educational opportunity for all Americans.

C. Theodore Molen, Jr.
Program Vice President
Publications and Public Affairs Division
The American College Testing Program

Introduction

Phillip E. Jones

This monograph presents a historical perspective on several issues related to the development of equal opportunity in higher education. These issues are: the development of Black higher education; the responses of historically White institutions to Black, other minority, and low income students; intelligence and achievement testing; the development and evaluation of educational support programs in predominantly White institutions; and the cost of financing higher education. Past and future issues bearing on the development of equality of opportunity in higher education were discussed by representatives of The American College Testing Program, the College Entrance Examination Board, the Institute for Services to Education, the Educational Testing Service, The National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, and by the president of The University of Iowa. The occasion for the discussions was The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, conducted in Iowa City, Iowa, during the summers of 1973 and 1974. The institute was funded through a grant from the U.S. Office of Education under Part IV of the Education Professions Development Act.

During the past ten years, ACT, CEEB, and ETS have had to grapple with the discriminatory effects of admission and achievement tests on minority and low income students. ACT, CEEB, and ETS have been working to develop programs for high school and college counselors in order to increase educational opportunities for culturally different students in the full range of post-secondary institutions. ISE and NSSFNS have advocated the admission and financial support of Black and other minority students in higher education. Major concerns of ISE and NSSFNS are the provision of adequate academic support and personal counseling, and the development of innovative teaching methods in higher education institutions in response to the interests and needs of Black, other minority, and low income students.

The topics discussed at the institute provide historical contexts for a number of recent events in higher education that involve desegregation, financial support, and equality of opportunity. Stephen Wright, the vice president of CEEB (now retired), discussed the significance of historically Black colleges, a subject brought into view recently by the desegregation case *Adams* v. *Califano* (originally *Adams* v. *Richardson*), in which the University of Tennessee at Nashville was ordered to merge with Tennessee State Univer-

sity. Dr. Wright's comments also provide a background for understanding the *Pratt* decision on HEW guidelines for desegregating higher education institutions in the southern states.

Elias Blake, Jr., who was president of ISE at the time of the conference and is now president of Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia, spoke about historical patterns in the development of equal opportunity, a topic which sheds light on the possible repercussions of inflation and recession (a factor in such events as the establishment of tuition at City College in New York) for Black, other minority, and low income students.

William Turnbull, the president of ETS, discussed the development of testing and its relation to educational opportunity programs, and stressed the need for better tests and better use of test results. Dr. Turnbull's comments relate to the current controversy about preferential admissions centered around the Bakke case, and provide a historical context for understanding how college admission came to be based on test scores.

Fred F. Harcleroad, who was president of ACT at the time of the conference and is now chairman of the Committee on Higher Education at the University of Arizona at Tucson, spoke about financial aid and EOP students. Dr. Harcleroad's position supporting low tuition in order to make higher education accessible to low income people was supported by Willard L. Boyd, president of The University of Iowa. Mr. Boyd discussed the future of equal educational opportunities. Financing higher education for low income and culturally different people presents a greater barrier than culturally biased admission criteria. When resources are scarce, those with more of the objective criteria—grades and test scores, which correlate highly with socioeconomic status—are given preference, a position which works to the detriment of Black, other minority, and low income students.

Finally, Hugh W. Lane, who was president of NSSFNS, outlined a model for evaluating EOPs which was developed by Ralph Tyler in the 1940s, and which remains a challenge for EOP professionals today.

The discussions in this report will, we hope, stimulate the thinking of faculty, counselors, and administrators, and encourage them to develop greater awareness of issues affecting equal opportunity in higher education. The general atmosphere of the institute was casual, and the presentations were made in a seminar setting. The editorial style of this publication reflects the informal atmosphere of the institute.

The Black College in Historical Perspective

Stephen Wright

I would like to take you back to 1865 when the Civil War ended. The situation, in brief, was that roughly four million slaves had been freed and 96 percent of them were illiterate. I think that is one of the remarkable things about Black people: that in a situation like this Black colleges were founded more on hope and faith than on reality. I have divided the history of these institutions into four parts.

Period I, right after the Civil War, I call the period of White denominations founding Black institutions, and this ran roughly from 1865 to 1875. In that period, the Congregational church, operating through its missionary wing, the American Missionary Association, as one example, got under way such institutions as Hampton Institute, Howard University, Atlanta University, Talladega College, and Fisk University, among others. Other denominations were also active in this period. You will recall that institutions like St. Paul's College, among others, were founded by the Episcopalians. And there were others like the Baptists who got institutions like Shaw University established. I am sure you all know the stories of the humble beginnings of these institutions. Atlanta University was founded in a railroad car; Fisk University was founded in an abandoned hospital barrack which still stands on the campus; Hampton Institute was founded in a small abandoned school house; and there is a story that Talladega College was founded in an abandoned jail. These were necessarily humble circumstances, because no big corporations had been made for these institutions, and the teachers and their leaders were in all instances, according to my knowledge, White. But they were missionaries in the finest sense of the word.

Many of these institutions had to begin with grade one, because as I have indicated, 96 percent of the people were illiterate. I met a woman who was an alumna of Fisk University, who went to elementary school at Fisk, high school at Fisk, college at Fisk, and finally received a master's degree from Fisk. Obviously, at its beginning it was not a university, and I will say a little more about that later.

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

The need for teachers at this point in time was so pressing and so urgent that by 1875, what I call the second period of the founding of these institutions began. This was the period when the Black denominations, the Methodists, and the several denominations of the Methodist church began establishing their institutions. The AMEs (African Methodist Episcopals) finally established eleven institutions, many more than that denomination could begin to support in a fundamental and adequate sense. This founding period, when the Black denominations were concerned, lasted from 1875 to about 1890, and a number of those institutions, of course, still exist.

I call the period from 1890 to about 1950 Period III. This was the period when the state colleges for Blacks were established, and a whole plethora of them were established during this period. The period was a very long one, as you can see, from the 1890s to the 1950s. The thing that stretched it out so long was that the response to the needs of the Black community by the political structure in the South was a fairly slow one, compared to the speed that should have taken place. Let me give you two or three examples.

The state of North Carolina has five state-supported institutions. All of them, until 1922, were state teachers colleges or normal schools. In 1922, the state of North Carolina purchased what is now North Carolina Central University from an individual who was a fantastic legend in his own time, James Edward Shepard. It was then called a national training school. It became the first state-supported liberal arts college for Blacks in the United States.

In the 1930s, the state of Maryland purchased Morgan State College from the Methodists—the White Methodists; and at that time, the state of Mississippi purchased Jackson State College.

About that same time, the state of Mississippi established what I believe was the last of the full-blown state colleges for Blacks. I thought you might be interested in the story that is told about the founding of Mississippi Valley State College, which was known in the early days as "Itta Bena." The story is that one of the legislators, on the day that the legislature was scheduled to adjourn, rose and said, "Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a bill to establish another Negro college, and I want to establish it because there is no college in this state that teaches Negroes how to run a middlebuster." Now I know you know what a middlebuster is? A middlebuster is a plow. He said, "now I know they've got Alcorn out there, but that is a college that does not teach Niggers how to run middlebusters; and I offer this bill if I can get a second. I'd like to get this bill through today." He got a second, and I am told that the man who offered the second said, "Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend that bill by adding $100,000 to it for the hell of it." The bill and the amendment passed and that is how Itta Bena came into being, and it is now known as Mississippi Valley State College.

During this same period, in about 1948, Texas Southern University had a more auspicious beginning. The state of Texas appropriated the beneficent sum of some $2 million to establish a first-rate university in the city of Houston.

There are now, in the fourth period, what I call some *de facto* Black institutions. They are just as Black as the historical ones, but they are Black not so much by design as by their locations. I am speaking specifically now of Federal City College, which is 98 percent Black, and Washington Technical Institute, which is about 98 percent Black. I am speaking of Medgar Evers College, which is about 80 percent Black, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn; and Malcolm X Community College in Chicago, which again is about 98 percent Black. These are new Black institutions. Depending on how rigidly you define a Black college or university, there are about 110 to 112 such institutions in the United States.

There are two or three big exceptions to the brief outline I have given you about the founding periods of these institutions. One was the founding of Tuskegee Institute in 1881 by Booker T. Washington. It was not related to any denomination; therefore, it was an independent institution. Tuskegee had an influence on the higher education of Blacks far beyond the boundaries of the campus of Tuskegee. The basic idea behind the founding of Tuskegee was to train the kinds of people that the Black community needed, as visualized by Booker T. Washington. They needed teachers; they needed craftsmen; they needed tradesmen; they needed what he called in those days vocational, industrial education. When he combined his talents with Hampton Institute, from which he was graduated, they sold the notion of industrial education for Blacks all over the United States.

You will recall that Booker T. Washington had a running feud with W. E. B. Du Bois not merely on his philosophy about the rights of Blacks in society, but on the nature of the education that ought to be emphasized for Blacks. Du Bois spoke of the "talented tenth" as the group that he wanted to place the emphasis upon, and Booker T. Washington spoke of the education of the great masses of people. Booker T. Washington became perhaps the single most powerful Black person ever to live in this country.

The other exceptions to this historical sequence are the two or three Black institutions that were established before the Civil War. Lincoln University in Pennsylvania was one, and Wilberforce University in Ohio was another. Incidentally, all of the historically Black institutions, except those I call *de facto* Black institutions, are located either in southern states or in the border states. There are four that are located clearly north of the Mason-Dixon line. Pennsylvania has two, Cheyney State College and Lincoln University; and in Ohio, Central State University and Wilberforce University.

I think there are some landmark dates and developments in the Black colleges. One is the Jones study, done by a man named Thomas Jesse Jones in 1916, which represented the first survey of Black education in the United States. It came to a devastating conclusion—I may be oversimplifying it a little, but I am almost reporting the passage verbatim. It says that of all the institutions of higher learning for Blacks in the United States, only three were even worthy of the name "college," and they were Howard University, Meharry Medical College, and Fisk University. Now, what the case was at that time in these institutions, including Howard and Fisk, was that they were a mixture of high schools and colleges.

If you do not mind, I will give you a personal example that comes out of my own life. I was graduated from a Rosenwald school a long time ago. I was not within 150 miles of a public high school. There were not any. As a matter of fact, the first public high school built for Blacks in the city of Atlanta, Georgia—a big southern city—was built in 1923, to give you some notion of how bad off the situation was. I therefore went to Hampton Institute for high school and entered the so-called academy. Howard had an academy; Fisk had an academy; Morehouse had an academy; and those were the kinds of high schools that Blacks of my particular age had to attend if they were going to get a high school education. When I first enrolled in Hampton Institute Academy, there were more high school students at Hampton Institute than there were college students. When you look at the paucity of trained people available to many of these colleges at that point in time, you can see pretty easily how Jones could come to his conclusion. Nineteen Sixteen was a landmark period, when people began to get serious about developing some of these institutions to the point where they were collegiate in grades.

Now let me diverge for just a moment. I have already inferred that there was no such thing as a public high school system for Blacks until after World War I. In that period, say 1920 to 1930, public high schools for Blacks in the southern region were developed. The thing that did most to make it possible was the philanthropy of Julius Rosenwald and the Rosenwald schools. Rosenwald schools were built this way: Rosenwald gave a third, a county or municipality gave a third, and the people (the Black people) raised a third. It is on this base that the high schools became possible in the area.

The Black colleges at that time were in such poor condition that when you received a baccalaureate degree from one of these institutions and wanted to do graduate work in one of the bigger universities, you had to validate your bachelor's degree, because there was no such thing as an accredited Black college in the whole southern region at that time. Which brings me to the second date that I would like you to be aware of.

The date is 1930, which marks the beginning of the effort of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to accredit the Black colleges. They did not admit Black colleges to the association, but they had a special commit-

tee on the accreditation of "Negro institutions," as they put it in those days. There were two lists of institutions. There was an A list for the better ones, a B list for those that were second-ranked in quality, and the others remained unacceptable. It was an important thing, because it allowed Blacks to go from these Black colleges to the graduate schools of the North and West without loss of credit. In other words, the baccalaureate degree from Black institutions began to be respected and accepted by White institutions.

The third date I would like to bring to your attention is 1938. This was the year the Supreme Court of the United States handed down the so-called *Gaines* decision. Lloyd Gaines had sued for admission to the University of Missouri Law School on the grounds that he was a citizen of the state of Missouri and entitled to admission, and that the provision of state scholarships for Blacks to study law outside the state was not equal treatment. The Supreme Court agreed with him, and the state of Missouri went about establishing a law school at Lincoln University in Missouri.

The *Gaines* decision had reverberations all over the southern region far beyond the state of Missouri. For example, the state of North Carolina vested in Dr. James Edward Shepard, the president of what is now North Carolina Central University, the authority to establish a law school when any two blacks applied for admission to the University of North Carolina or North Carolina State University at Raleigh. As a result, he established what is now the North Carolina Central University Law School. He also established a library school, and was about to establish a school of pharmacy—and probably would have—but he began to grow ill in his later years, and the scene was shifting. What was happening at North Carolina Central University was happening all over the region. Graduate programs sprang up in these institutions overnight. There was a law school at Texas Southern University, which was a primary reason Texas Southern came into being, and an engineering program was established there also. At one point in time North Carolina Central University offered a Ph.D. degree in cooperation with the University of North Carolina; of course, that was subsequently discontinued.

What all of this did was to show that in effect we had in the southern region two systems of higher education, one for Blacks and one for Whites, and nobody crossed the line. They were developed on the then legal doctrine of "separate but equal." I remember making a speech once in which I said the library holdings at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill exceeded all of the holdings in all of the Black state colleges in all of the states in the South, including those in border states—just to show you how unequal it was.

The next date I would like to call to your attention is 1954. As you know, this was the year of the Supreme Court's great *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (of

Topeka, Kansas) decision. While the case had its origin in the public schools, its ramifications and implications were very broad for higher education as well.

Let me give you an example. I was president of Bluefield State College in West Virginia at that time, and within thirty days the state Board of Education in West Virginia gave all of us a one-sentence directive, and I quote verbatim. It said: "All colleges operating under jurisdiction of the West Virginia Board of Education will admit students without regard to race, effective immediately." That is all it said. That fall, three White students enrolled at Bluefield State College, and it is now nearly 80 percent White. West Virginia State, then the other Black college in the state, is now 90 percent White.

The question is, are Bluefield State College and West Virginia State College Black or White? (That is what I meant a short while ago when I said the number of Black colleges depended on how you define Black college.) This kind of thing, together with the 1964 Civil Rights Law and the litigation that followed, have combined to help to desegregate a number of Black institutions, but none have gone as far as either West Virginia State or Bluefield State. But let me give you two or three more examples: the enrollment at Lincoln University in Missouri is over 50 percent White at the present time; at Bowie State College in Maryland, it is about 25 percent White; and it's about 40 percent White—I checked—at Kentucky State University at Frankfort.

These changes are very evident, and they are changing the character of these institutions. The change at Bluefield was so bitter that the students bombed the brand new student union. What was involved was that the Black kids saw the traditions of this institution—small, intimate, personal in its approach—disappearing and changing character. The schools had an enormous amount of spirit, and they fought to keep it. The traditions of some of these schools were just wiped out, and the kind of litigation that stopped it was too late; this is what some of the kids are worried about now and why some of these schools are concerned.

The next big thing to remember about these Black colleges is that for many years, the enrollment represented 80 to 90 percent of the Black enrollment in higher education. To give you some illustration of how important a system this was: it is a fact that today, approximately 90 percent of all of the physicians and dentists in this country who are Black are graduates of either Howard University or Meharry Medical College. Probably as high as 70 percent of the Black lawyers in this country—it's changing now, mind you—are graduates of Black law schools. And even to this moment, 70 percent of all Black students enrolled in engineering are enrolled in the six schools of engineering that are Black. —All this from a system that was ostensibly deficient, based on the doctrine of "separate but equal." It was nowhere near equal by anyone's stretch of the imagination.

We are approaching a moment of truth about the relationship of these colleges to the systems of higher education in the states. Let me give you two examples. In 1968, the University of Tennessee sought to establish a branch of the University of Tennessee in the city of Nashville, to award baccalaureate degrees and ostensibly to provide continuing education for the citizens of Nashville. A girl named Sanders sued the governor and the university on the grounds that they were wasting taxpayers' money, because Tennessee A & I State University is located in Nashville with a forty-million-dollar plant, and at that point something on the order of 6,500 students. The judge did not issue an injunction to stop the building, but rather he issued an order to the state of Tennessee to dismantle the dual system. And they have been presenting plans for the dismantling of the dual system since 1968. The fact of the matter is that the new institution has already begun to draw on the enrollment of Tennessee State, and the institution at this point is on the defensive for its life.

In addition to that, there are nine so-called *Adams* v. *Richardson*[1] cases that have required nine states to develop detailed plans for the dismantling of the dual system of higher education. In those states, this has had a profound effect, because what these plans seek to do is to provide some division of labor for the work to be done in higher education, to assure Blacks of being appropriately represented population-wise both vertically and horizontally on the faculties and staffs of the predominately White institutions. Of course you cannot have it both ways; it also has to happen in Black institutions. I have been one of a whole series of experts that the Office of Civil Rights and HEW have called in to help them examine those plans in two different ways. The most recent wave of examinations resulted in the approval, I think, of eight of the nine plans. Built into each of these plans is a monitoring system that will allow each plan to get looked at twice a year, to see whether the goals to achieve dismantling of the system are on target.

One brief final point. I told you that for many years something on the order of 90 percent of all of the Blacks enrolled in higher education were in Black institutions. Four years ago, maybe five, the balance of Black enrollment shifted from the Black colleges to the predominately White colleges. There are now something on the order of 165,000 students enrolled in these Black institutions, and all the rest of the enrollment among Blacks is in the predominately White institutions, with heavy concentration, as you would suspect, in the community colleges.

---

[1]Now known as *Adams* v. *Califano*.

The Development of Equal Opportunity in Relation to Historical Patterns in Higher Education

Elias Blake, Jr.

I will start by telling you a little about ISE, the Institute for Services to Education, because I think the background on ISE will set the framework for my remarks about the historical patterns in higher education that relate to the development of the concept of equality of educational opportunity in higher education. In 1965, six precollege centers were created by ISE: Howard University, Fisk University, Dillard University, Texas Southern University, Morehouse College, and Webster College in Webster Grove, Missouri. Students were taken into the centers during the summer before they entered college. The purpose of the special programs in the centers was to assist the students in developing basic academic competencies for college work. Florida A. & M. University also had a variation of the program. There were about seventeen such programs around the country, but ISE had put together six in a package. The difference in ISE's program was that we were trying to approach developmental education with a coherent educational philosophy and program—with educational materials and methods that would deal in a rational way with what we perceived to be the characteristics of Black students coming out of high school and going to college. The Office of Economic Opportunity bought the idea and created the national Upward Bound Program, and ISE was awarded the first contract because of the six centers.

In 1967, ISE moved from precollege programs to college programs, with the intent of creating continuity in the development of academic competencies during the freshman year. The freshman year program included English, mathematics, science, social science, and counseling. It was a complete academic program in which a student would enroll as a freshman, for academic credit. In conjunction with the freshman year program, ISE established six-week summer residential workshops for faculty primarily from Black colleges and three-week workshops for college counselors. One of the basic ideas in the programs is that educational change has to flow through the people who are in the classrooms with the students. People like yourselves and people like me are only going to be effective change agents to the

---

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

extent that we begin to change the behavior of people who have the primary contact with the students. At ISE we have found that one can change the behavior of a significant number of faculty if one can change the pattern of teaching and learning in the classrooms. The freshman year programs now involve thirty-five colleges.

Other programs with which ISE has been involved are also related to changing behavior in the classroom. We have developed some model graduate programs at Atlanta University and at Fisk University for the training of college teachers. We are interested mainly in Black colleges, and to a lesser extent in community colleges. We are trying to help people do better academic planning. We are also developing a data bank for the Black colleges. We have been doing surveys among the Black colleges to get accurate data. In the near future, we plan to expand the data to include more information about Blacks nationally. I wanted you to be aware of the background of ISE, because it will provide support for some of the ideas I will be presenting.

I would like to look first at the basic structure of higher education. I think it is important to understand the nature of colleges and universities. If we start with private education, we will recognize that the most prestigious higher education institutions started as special-purpose institutions. Harvard College was essentially a ministerial, theological institution. Harvard developed into a general-purpose institution and then into a very prestigious institution. You can see the same pattern of development in many institutions that began with a special purpose: as they developed strength, they shifted to general-purpose institutions.

The land grant colleges were started as special-purpose institutions for farmers and people who could not get into private higher education. They were agricultural and mechanical colleges. In *Negro Higher Education in the South*, Henry Bullock described the development of industrial education, which was Booker T. Washington's answer in Tuskegee Institute to the need for agricultural, intellectual, philosophical, and ideological pursuits. The land grant colleges were precisely the same kind of institutions, developed in agricultural country, for the special purpose of creating a higher education system for rural people.

The next phase of public higher education developed with the rise of the public school systems. First there were agricultural colleges, then came the state teachers colleges, again for a special purpose. The state teachers colleges were developed primarily to create a supply of teachers for the public elementary and secondary schools. Teachers colleges in many states, particularly during the last ten years, have begun to change. For example, Southern Illinois University, which was a state teachers college, experienced

great growth and began to compete with the University of Illinois as an alternative public institution. I was in Pennsylvania at a place called Millersville State College in southern Pennsylvania. Millersville was once a state teachers college, but it is now becoming a public, general-purpose, liberal arts college, probably up to the master's level. The parallels between Millersville and some of the large public Black colleges in the South, such as Florida A. & M. University, Tennessee State University, or Jackson State College, are astounding. Most of the Millersville students were being trained to be teachers in Pennsylvania. But the administration at Millersville is trying to reduce the proportion of students being trained to teach, and get more people interested in specific science fields, history, and other humanities. The institution has a female enrollment which is disproportionately high compared to Pennsylvania State University. Black teacher-training institutions have many of the same problems as the developing, predominantly White, state teachers colleges.

The tendency of public institutions to follow the elite institutions in higher education is a dangerous trend for all efforts like EOPs. When the faculty and the administration at publicly supported institutions want to become the Harvard, the Yale, or the Princeton of their particular locality, the impact of the institutional environment can be detrimental to Black students. The deans, faculty, and departmental chairmen may have objectives that are not conversant with the development of supportive programs. The movement toward getting "bigger and better" each year is running into trouble because of the inflationary spiral as well as other factors. Hence, increased efforts to support EOP may become more difficult to realize.

On the other hand, it may become harder to get increased support for supportive programs in public institutions because of the enormous impact of the growth of community colleges in the states. The development of community colleges could be an advantage for Blacks because the community colleges are more accessible. More Blacks go to them. The question is whether the articulation pattern between the community colleges and the four-year institutions promotes adequate transitions for Black students. Many people are supporting community colleges as a new kind of democratic institution that opens doors to higher education for Blacks, the poor, and the disadvantaged. The question has to be raised as to whether the community colleges are living up to their rhetoric as most helpful to the disadvantaged. How democratic is an institution where 40 to 55 percent of the general student population is part time, where 25 to 55 percent of the enrollment is nondegree credit enrollment, where the graduation rate up through the baccalaureate degree is approximately 20 or 25 percent of the people who enter? These are general issues that do not deal only with Blacks. However, these trends are going to fall with disproportionate weight on Blacks in community colleges. Even more Blacks are going to be part-time,

nondegree students, and even fewer Blacks are going to get their associate of arts or baccalaureate degrees. These are illustrations of general trends in higher education.

Higher education is going to have to move to an open-access system. I would be opposed to a hierarchical system, such as in California, where everybody can get into the community colleges and a selected number of people can get into the four-year institutions. That system has not worked for minorities in California, so why should we assume that it will work anywhere else?

Now let us look at open enrollment in New York, because what happened there is very instructive. Historically, the City College of New York started out with a city system which was supposed to provide open access. As the system developed, rather than serving the people of New York City who needed education the most, the system turned into an elitist system that one could only get into if one could pass the regents' examination at a certain level, or if one had a high school average in or near the 80s. Many people were not getting into the system because they could not qualify. When the institution changed the qualifications for admission in the 1960s, two White students showed up for every one Black and Puerto Rican. There is still no equality, because the Whites are in a much better academic position than the Blacks and the Puerto Ricans.

The SEEK program (the name for supportive services) at the institution became vulnerable because it made a fundamental error. The program stressed psychological readiness to a great extent, but it did not put sufficient emphasis on the development of academic competencies. Obviously, such an approach has defects in a system where the faculty is not interested in developmental education. Students' arithmetic has to be in order as well as their psychological state, or they will be caught in a revolving door. I think it is constructive to look at the New York system, which was one of the first such systems to open.

I am not arguing against support programs, because I think they are essential; but the basic issue is faculty support for educational reform at the freshman and sophomore levels. If one does not have a strategy for making the first two years of college more humane for all students, then Blacks do not have much of a chance. Faculty must become responsible for the quality of instruction in institutions. That is something that has seldom happened in higher education. Students flunk out because of the characteristics of the students and not the quality of instruction. That is the logic that is used on all students, not just Blacks. One has to try to break away from old models and develop a different model, a model which gets the faculty involved in having the responsibility for the educational characteristics of the students.

The significance of the Black college in the developmental trends of higher education is the fact that Black colleges have not been part of the pattern of elitist education. It was not that Black colleges did not want to be elitist, but it was just a physical and practical impossibility. For example, most of the Black colleges never aspired to have selective admissions policies. The faculties knew that every year the new students were going to be doing seventh- and eighth-grade arithmetic and English. There was no point in lamenting the fact that they could not read or write well. If most people were doing eighth-grade arithmetic, then ninth- and tenth-grade arithmetic would be postponed until the students developed the academic competencies for more advanced work. There is a trend in some Black colleges now which I argue against. As many Black colleges become stronger and more successful, they, too, are beginning to move toward the general higher education model. Some Black institutions are trying to become more like the standard higher education institutions, rather than recognizing that their strengths were always in the strong developmental programs which were not characteristic of higher education institutions.

Characteristically, the Black college had a full-time student body. If you went to one of those institutions, you had to enroll in a full course of study moving toward graduation. About 87 percent of the enrollment in Black colleges was full time. They also tended to be residential institutions. The Black colleges were a national system of Black higher education. They have created a Black middle class in America which in turn has given leadership to the Black community. That is an unimpeachable historical fact.

Finally, the generalized model represented by these Black institutions will have trouble finding roots in many historically White institutions. Yet, to have the same success as the Black colleges, they must try. The job of administrative leadership is to find ways to increase the probabilities that the developmental, supportive patterns are long-lived. Basic policy decisions are necessary as well as adequate personnel and budgeting allocations. If Black educators in these institutions do not commit themselves to these issues for a protracted period of time, disappointment in the production of graduates at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels will surely follow.

A Historical Account of Testing As It Relates to Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

William Turnbull

When I first heard about this institute, I thought it was one of the most important kinds of activities that could be undertaken. So when I was invited to come and join in with you for a while I was very glad to have the chance, and I am glad to be here. I was asked to reflect on the history of the testing movement and how it relates to EOP. I thought it would be more helpful to you and more helpful to me, too, if we just took it in a very informal way. I will comment about some ideas, and I hope you will chime in, because that way we will all, I think, learn the most.

The beginning of modern-day tests and measurements goes back to Galton in England and Binet in France. At about the turn of the century, Binet developed a concept of mental age. But it was a German by the name of Stern who invented what I think has been a major disaster of western life. He thought up the idea of dividing the mental age by the chronological age and called it the IQ. Stern regretted it almost as soon as he had done it, but it became one of those handy tools that really caught fire—especially in America, although not particularly in Europe. In the early 1900s, Stern had one of his young graduates go to America to try to kill the IQ, but he could not, as you know; and so here, just about sixty years later, the IQ is still going strong. More and more people in the profession of measurement realize all the problems with it and are trying to do away with it, but not everybody. There is nothing that has caught the imagination of the lay public and caused, I think, so much mischief as the concept of the IQ.

In America, things really took hold with Terman's work in the early 1900s. The period of 1910 to 1920—World War I—was the first launching pad for this new so-called science of measurement and for the mass application of psychological tests during the war. Otis, E. L. Thorndike, Carl Brigham, and others really began the mass testing of people later, and it was at that point that the different performances of different ethnic groups first became a matter for general attention. The World War I period was the beginning, I think, of the whole history of genetic interpretation of score differences on tests, especially intelligence tests. We have been trying to do away with some of the fallacies that led to those interpretations ever since.

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

At the same time, paralleling those developments back in the 1900s was the more traditional development of examinations for entrance to universities. The College Board was founded back in 1900. It was really a move then to simplify the way in which kids could move from school to college, particularly in private education, which of course was much bigger relative to the total of higher education in the early 1900s than it is today. In those days, when students wanted to go to a particular college or university, they had to go to the right preparatory school first and take a course that prepared them for the examinations that were given on the campus at Yale, or wherever it was that they were prepared to go. So if a student changed his or her mind and wanted to go to the University of Maryland, it was no good, because Maryland had a different set of exams and the student was not prepared for those. The College Board came into being to provide one common set of exams that any university might recognize, if it chose to do so, and quite a few of them did—there were 12 at the beginning, and there are now 1,200.

But these two streams were quite different. On the one hand was the development of psychological tests—standardized tests—and on the other, the development of an examination for entrance to universities. Then Carl Brigham came along in the 1920s and began experimentally trying to bring these two lines of thinking together to develop something that he hoped would be useful information for a student who was interested in going to college, but would not have the tight linkage to school curriculum that was always representative of the College Board achievement test in the early days. So Brigham invented the Scholastic Aptitude Test. The whole idea of that examination was that it ought to be as free as possible from the preparation that was required by any particular college. So the twenties, coming along in this chronology, were the time of the experimental merging of the traditional psychological examination and the traditional college entrance examination.

In the thirties, they were brought together and made operational. In the 1930s the College Board Exams (forgive me if I talk just about those; they are what I happen to know most about) began to look more and more free from any particular curriculum. Both the SAT and the achievement tests began to take on more of the characteristics that are known today as standardized measurements and as testing technique. But that was kind of a quiet period; there were college places for just about anybody who wanted to go. In those days, selection was not too much of an issue except on a very few campuses, and that was the condition right up to World War II. And, of course, higher education ground to a halt pretty much during the war.

Right after the war, the modern era that lasted right up through the sixties was a twenty-five-year period of tremendous pressure to get into college, beginning with the veterans coming back after the war. Because building could not keep pace with demand, institutions suddenly had a lot more

people knocking on the door than they had places to accommodate. The shortage led to very stringent selection in a lot of institutions, beginning with the old line or prestigious ones, and gradually fanning out to institutions that historically had not been selective. So the whole idea of limiting admissions really took on serious form after the war, and measurement and testing began to be used very widely in higher education, and also at about that time in industry. More and more people found that any way they wanted to go, some kind of requirement of testing had to be surmounted before the opportunity to enroll in a program was granted to them.

At about that time, the College Board realized that there were demands being made for tests. Requests were coming in for all kinds of assistance with testing for things other than college entrance. Because no research staff had been built up, there was no expertise gathered there; people knew how to do testing, test construction, and application. The College Board felt that its job was really in the school or college transition business. The same thing was happening to some other places. The American Council on Education had a set of testing programs. The Carnegie Foundation also had a testing program at the graduate level. So those three groups got together . . . to find out what organizations would have enough resources to do a good research job, so that in the future, measurement techniques could be developed and improved. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) came into being . . . almost immediately after World War II, 1947. I will come back later to what has happened to the organization since then.

Well, coming on through the fifties, of course there was the baby boom right after World War II, leading to tremendous pressures on the schools, first elementary . . . and then just beginning with secondary schools as the population explosion started in 1946. Selection was becoming a greater problem for public institutions in the midwestern part of the country. In fact, they had no recourse except to become interested in some way of trying to decide in advance who was going to profit most from the educational experience offered on campus. The American College Testing Program (ACT) was formed in the late 1950s. This was by and large a response to the interest of the public institutions.

At that time, in the fifties, there was the beginning of concern in a major way, I think, with the social consequences of selection for college admission on the basis of how well a person had done in school, or how well he or she was going to do on the test. Before that, there had been scattered interest: there had been research mainly by sociologists Allison Davis, who had done a lot of work in the 1940s, and Kenneth Eells. You may be familiar with what were called the Davis-Eells Games, which were an attempt to pose test-like questions in a game situation so the kids would get over the barrier of having to sit down in a strange way with a paper-and-pencil test that many youngsters at that time had not had any experience with. If they could play

these realistic games, then the reasoning was that you could find out something about their ability to function. It was a great idea, but it did not work very well. The problem was that when you followed up to see whether those kids who could play those games well did well in college, the correlation was near zero. So it looked good, but did not pan out for reasons that can be debated. I think . . . major colleges were not realistic enough in the kinds of tasks they were setting, and the schools were not realistic enough in the kinds of tasks they were setting. Maybe the scores on the games were telling something useful that the educational system was not ready to capitalize on at that time. But for whatever reason, the scores were not telling the educational establishment anything that it could use in relation to what was being offered. That actually did not go very far; it stopped in the fifties, but the interest stayed on.

Going through quickly into the sixties, when everything was busting in education, more money was being put into educational research; grants were becoming available; "Great Society" programs were being invented; the whole Sputnik era was still very much on; and education was seen more and more as the way for everybody to enhance their opportunities in society in general. Testing became very firmly ensconced in several ways. The admission scene certainly was built on the utilization of selective tests. But more and more, after students got into college, it was seen that tests could be used for placement and for credit. The CLEP exams were born in the late 1950s and began to take hold. They are still not as prevalent as I think they ought to be. On college campuses they are a way for students who have gained experience in military service, or wherever, to demonstrate proficiency at the level that is going to be expected of students at the end of the term. Measurement was being used more and more in guidance in the elementary and secondary schools. The simple arithmetic of the number of people who wanted to get into universities versus the number of places for them when they got there was building into the kind of competitive frenzy that I think characterizes the whole admissions process in the 1960s.

The brightest development then was in community and junior colleges, which I think are one of the two or three genuinely American inventions in education. The land grant colleges were one; and the junior colleges, which do not have parallels developed strongly anywhere else in the world, I think constitute another; and so does the whole idea of open enrollment, which just gained like wildfire in the sixties, partly because of the excesses of competitive pressure that were being indulged in by the traditional institutions. So in some degree, I think the junior colleges were force-fed by the set of difficult problems which were being posed for students and society by the very narrow view of education that was being held to quite firmly in a lot of quarters. That narrow view was generating, by that time, very widespread concern with the social implications of basing postsecondary opportunity solely on the amount of developed ability students could show when they presented themselves for admission to a college or university.

To complete this very broad-brushed historical summary, the seventies brought a new ball game. There are now beginning to be plenty of places in colleges. You all know that the colleges are now looking for students, not turning them away. There are precious few institutions that are stringent now in their admissions requirements, although you hear a lot of noise about ones that are. I think they are quite disproportionate in number and importance on the educational scene. Guidance and placement are becoming much more the name of the game now for the students, schools, and colleges. And selection, I think, is going to become more and more, through the seventies, a matter of self-determination by a student of where he or she wants to pursue education past high school.

The issue of fairness—the issue of cultural bias, if you will—has grown in the seventies. Since those early days in the forties, when it was recognized by a few people (like Davis and Eells), it has continued right up through the seventies, when the issue now has surfaced in its most intense form at the graduate and professional level in the law schools with the *De Funis* case. There are so many instances now where those issues that were academic issues and research issues for so long are now being forced into public consciousness, and are being brought out in the courts. To some extent, if people in the testing activity are not sufficiently aggressive to try to analyze the situation and to try to recommend proper principles for use of admissions standards, we will have the issues resolved for us. It's going to be done through the judicial process, which is not a bad way, but I think the courts will make some mistakes along the way. I think that we in education have some responsibility to make sure that it is done in an enlightened way by the courts, so we do not repeat in the 1970s some of the lessons that we ought to have learned earlier.

Financing Postsecondary Education for EOP Students

Fred Harcleroad

I was asked to talk to you today about financing postsecondary education. There are several ways to approach this topic. I thought it might be instructive to start the discussion in a theoretical way, because when you get down to "gut-level" decision making on financing postsecondary education, what you believe forms the basis for your decisions. I remember once, when I was young, going to a lecture given by a noted philosopher from the University of Chicago. Suddenly about three-fourths of the way through the lecture, I realized I didn't believe a thing the lecturer was saying. I finally figured out that what had happened was I hadn't challenged his initial ideas—the fundamental, theoretical concepts he was using. Once you accept a basic premise, you can be led logically to things you really don't want to believe. For this reason, I think it is helpful when talking about financing postsecondary education to start by spending some time on what the choices are.

I would like to begin by referring to a publication that was written by Melvin D. Orwig, who was on the ACT staff several years ago. He put together a pretty good book on financing called *Financing Higher Education: The Alternatives for the Federal Government*, which addressed alternatives for the states. He pointed out that in 1948, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education made the earliest direct expression of a social commitment for universal higher education, stating that "every American should be enabled and encouraged to carry his [or her] education as far as natural capacities would permit."

That was the beginning concept. At that time the hope was that higher education would be financed in this country in such a way that half the people who graduated from high school would be able to go on to some form of higher education. That hope has been realized, because even in the states with the lowest percentages of students going on to higher education, up to 40 percent of the students graduating from high school go on to some form of postsecondary education. In the state of Oklahoma, for example, almost 75 percent of the high school graduates go into postsecondary

---

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

26

education; in some areas in California 90 to 95 percent go on to some form of postsecondary education.

However, let me point out one real fallacy in these statistics. The figures are all quoted against the high school graduating classes. The figures don't account for the students who dropped out before finishing high school, and that's still appreciable in some parts of the United States. If you're talking about opportunity to go on to higher education or postsecondary education in the way that the Truman commission was talking about it in 1948, you also have to look at what's happening in high schools. The facts of the matter are that even with some of these high figures I have just quoted on high school graduating classes, it's still less than half the age cohorts, or the age group, that are actually going on to postsecondary education.

Financial support for students is one of the biggest factors in the costs of higher education; how financial support should be provided is a very important social issue. Orwig states: "Nobody questions the capacity of our economy to support higher education in any way we choose to do it as a society." I think that is an important place to start. The money exists; it's a matter of choosing how to spend it.

How much does higher education, as we know it, now cost? Well, a little over twenty years ago, the cost of higher education was presumed to be somewhere around 1 to 1½ percent of the gross national product. The gross national product is pretty close to a trillion dollars a year, so 1 or 1½ percent of it would be a sizable amount. During the last twenty years, with the expanded population going into postsecondary education, the cost has gone up to between 2 and 2½ percent. The Carnegie Commission has estimated the cost to be about 3 percent of the gross national product. It is within our capacity as a nation to pay for whatever we want as a collective society. Start with that as a given. So, whenever you're discussing whether equal access programs can be financed, it isn't a matter of any state being too poor to do it. A state can do it; it is just a matter of choosing to do it.

I would like to refer to Orwig. In his summary of the issues in Chapter 13 (which is on pages 331 and 332), Orwig asserts that the theoretical question about financing any part of higher education is basically the same one that we faced in this country about 100 years ago. The basic theoretical issues relate directly to private benefits and equality of opportunity. There are two bases for discussing the issues. One is whether higher education is a private benefit that accrues to the individual; the second is whether higher education is a public benefit that accrues to the larger society. The facts of the matter are that it is both. Toward the end of this summation, the author states: "On the one hand, it's possible to focus on the availability of opportunity for higher education for different parts of the society; or, on the other, to be concerned with the return of investments in education as an

indication of the capacity of different individuals to benefit from higher education."

I espouse low or no tuition. If it hadn't been for low tuition, I wouldn't have gone to college. In my judgment, low tuition is necessary for providing equality of opportunity.

Economists believe that we should be concerned with the return on our investments—the marketplace approach to higher education. Becker asserts, in Orwig's book, that the investment made in college education, primarily by an individual, returns an average rate of 13 percent to the economy before taxes. If an individual pays the cost of education while attending college, and then pays again in taxes after college, that person will essentially pay one-third of his or her income in taxes for education. That is an approximation based on the fact that 35 to 38 percent of every dollar a person earns is paid back in taxes. A higher proportion of the cost of higher education is paid by people who have had more education than those who have had less. So, the question then becomes, "Should a person who attends college pay for higher education twice?" A lot of economists think so, because they think of paying for higher education as an investment to achieve results that will benefit human society and the individual.

In *Financing Higher Education*, the author discusses four factors affecting the economics of higher education. One factor is a market mechanism, the concept on which the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program is based. Another is the monopoly conditions that affect the supply of funds for education; the third is imperfections of the capital markets; and the last is a lack of knowledge about the return of educational investments.

Another important point to remember about providing the costs of financing postsecondary education is that people from the lower socioeconomic strata do not have the resources necessary to pay for the costs of obtaining a higher education. From an economic point of view, low income people represent a relatively high risk investment because of high attrition rates among lower income students. However, high attrition among low income students may not only be a result of academic failure but may also occur because some students can't afford to pay for more than one year. The economist might assert that unless the students finish their education and get the certification, the cost provided for the first year is a waste. I disagree with that point of view. I have known, as I'm sure you have known, people who benefited greatly from attending college, although they did not graduate. The notion of high economic risk applies directly to EOP students.

Even when there is an adequate loan market, some economists believe that low income students are a high risk because they tend to be afraid of long

term debt. Some students may fear they won't be successful in higher education and may not be able to repay the loans. I have talked to some students who are acquainted with personal high returns on anything they borrow, but they know that the idea of going into debt is just not very smart for anybody. The loan markets for low income students these days are not always the best way to encourage people to go into postsecondary education.

In the long run, the best way to encourage students to attend higher education institutions appears to be low or no tuition. In states which provide easy access through low or no tuition, students grow up knowing from an early age that they can attend a college either close by or at not too great a distance. With such an expectation, and the constant experience of seeing older students taking advantage of the low or no tuition opportunity, a much higher proportion of low income or poor students **do** go on to college. A prime example, as of this date, is the difference between New Jersey and California. In California, as many as 90 to 95 percent of high school graduates go on to some form of higher education. The single major factor is the low or no tuition characteristic of the many community colleges, the state colleges, and the various university campuses. In New Jersey, with much higher tuition and fees, approximately one-third of the students are able to attend higher educational institutions—and their expectations, as they grow up, are almost exactly the opposite of comparable students in California. Thus, EOP students in states with low or no tuition are in by far the best situation to attend postsecondary institutions.

Future Considerations on the Development of Educational Opportunity Programs

Willard L. Boyd

In my interpretation of everything that is happening and has happened in this country in recent years, and indeed throughout the world, the driving force in the world today is obviously equality of opportunity. Those who have not had the opportunity to participate in the past are going to participate now and in the future. One of those opportunities for participation is in education. I now am beginning to wonder what kind of education.

I was asked to comment about the future of Educational Opportunity Programs, and I would like to briefly observe a few points which are quite shocking to me. The case is made very persuasively by the community colleges that they, as low or no tuition institutions, are really the institutions which will best serve those people who have not been previously served. This is a very important and valid point to a limited degree. The corollary of this case is that the four-year institutions, public and private, colleges and universities, are out of phase with society and have very little to offer people, except perhaps the luxury of going to four-year institutions, or the opportunity to engage in professions which will yield students so much money that they can afford to pay high tuition.

I am not one who believes that everyone should go to a four-year institution. I'm a strong believer in the role of the community college and its important stake in coming to grips with some of the tremendous problems, both social and economic, in this country.

Nevertheless, I would like to have four-year institutions remain as viable in the future as they have been in the last one hundred years since the Morrill Act. But one gets the impression that the public is beginning to think of four-year institutions as being out of phase with what is so-called relevant. There is

---

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

no question that in the case of public institutions, low tuition has been what has brought students into the institutions. You can have all kinds of aid programs, but they may get so complicated that young, inexperienced people may simply be frightened off by the whole process of borrowing money, filling out forms, and sort of mortgaging their future without realizing what might be forthcoming. Therefore, I think we have an obligation to argue very strenuously for low tuition in the case of four-year public institutions.

The way that private institutions can be helped is through institutional, federal, or state aid. They indeed should have that kind of support because high tuition will not help any students.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOGs) are being advanced by some as the panacea for social ills. They are in fact the ways in which the right to education is being implemented. They are pitting the low-income against the middle-income, and this can only be to the great disadvantage of this country. It is a specious issue; it's a wrong issue; both will lose. Therefore, of course we want BEOGs, we want them supported, but at the same time we also want to have other kinds of opportunities—the direct loan funds, the work-study funds—and not simply rely on the guaranteed loan, which has never been well supported or implemented. BEOGs really are not the best way to provide widespread accessibility to higher education.

Recently, TRIO programs (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services-Educational Opportunity Centers) have been subjected to very strong, and apparently very effective, criticism. Yet what could be more important than maintaining such programs as TRIO? If there are problems with TRIO, they can be rectified, but TRIO programs certainly should not be abolished as programs. Which leads me to wonder: how strenuously are we lobbying for EOP support both at the national and state level?

Here at Iowa, we have basically expanded EOP internally. But we have also taken to the State Board of Regents and to the legislature requests for this kind of program above and beyond what we would try to get out of normal student aid when we raised the tuition. Obviously, we want to put away a certain amount of any tuition hike for student aid. What I am trying to say is that I believe we have got to lobby more effectively for EOP support both at the federal and the state levels.

We also must make every effort to be sure that student aid is left for disposition on the campuses and not cycled through an ever-increasing bureaucracy at the state level. Student aid officers should be allowed to continue to deal with the students because it's the students who are

involved. The student is a person, and not a thing; the student is more than a statistic. To the extent that you can have more contact with the individual, the programs will all be more successful, whatever their nature.

My points are few, but I think quite important. One is that we should all be supporting low tuition. Another is that we should all be supporting methods for bringing low income and minority students into the universities, into four-year public and private colleges and universities as well as into the community colleges, so that students indeed do have a real choice, a real equality of opportunity.

A Historical Model for Evaluating Equal Opportunity Programs

Hugh W. Lane

I was asked to speak to you about the need for evaluation of special programs, and to present a model of evaluation. I have gathered together some old materials with which you may not be familiar. I am simply going to try to work through the materials with you, and I hope we can discuss some of their implications for the present situation in EOPs.

The first one is very old; in fact, it was copyrighted in 1942, and it is from a report that was called "The Eight-Year Study of Secondary Education of the Progressive Education Association." The study was recorded in a volume called *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*, which was published by Harper & Brothers. It is now out of print. I want to highlight some points from the chapter on the purpose and procedure of evaluation. It is probably the cornerstone document in the field of evaluation. The field is identified with the name of Ralph Tyler, and in this chapter he talks about what evaluation is. He also talks about the theory of objectives and the theory of learning. He begins by saying the term *evaluation* was used to describe the staff and the project, rather than terms such as *measurement*, *test*, or *examination*, because the term *evaluation* implies a process by which the values of an enterprise are ascertained. In the next section, he talks about the major purposes of evaluation, and he defines five. One important purpose of evaluation is to make a periodic check on the effectiveness of the educational institution and, thus, to indicate the points at which appraisals of the program are necessary. A second very important purpose of evaluation, which is frequently not recognized, is to validate the hypotheses upon which the educational institution operates. (I assume that each time I refer to *educational institution* you will translate that into *school*, *college*, or *program*, as appropriate.) A third important purpose of evaluation is to provide information basic to effective guidance of individual students. A fourth purpose of evaluation is to provide a certain psychological security to the staff, the students, and the parents. The fifth purpose of evaluation, which should be emphasized, is to provide a sound basis for public relations.

This paper is transcribed from an address delivered at The University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators, 1973-74.

Evaluation can achieve these five purposes and can provide a periodic check which will give direction to the continued improvement of the program. It can help to validate some of the important hypotheses upon which the program operates. It can furnish data about individual students which is essential for wise guidance. It can provide a more satisfactory foundation for the psychological security of the staff, the parents, and the students. It can supply a sound basis for public relations. For these purposes to be achieved, however, they must be kept continually in mind when planning and developing the program of evaluation. The evaluation staff that is responsible for what is to be evaluated, for the techniques of appraisal, and for the summary and interpretation of results should make its decisions in terms of the five important purposes.

I will list eight assumptions of what evaluation should be that were developed in this project. These are assumptions rather than purposes, but they underlie the whole Tyler argument of what educational evaluation is. In these assumptions, education is defined as changing the behavior of human beings in a desired direction. The test of a program is, "Are human beings changing in the direction which the program supports?" It is no more complicated than that. A lot of the arguments disappear if one always goes back to the assumption that education is a process of changing the behavior of a human being in a desired direction. If you talk about a theory of learning, of evaluation or measuring behavior, the real problem is translating global terms in which educational goals are generally stated, into actual behaviors which can be observed and measured.

A second basic assumption is that the kinds of changes in behavioral patterns of students which the program encourages are the educational objectives of the program. There are no other educational objectives except those changes in the behaviors of the students.

A third basic assumption is that an educational program is appraised by finding out the extent to which the objectives of the program are actually being realized. Since the program seeks to bring about certain changes in the behaviors of students, and since these are the fundamental educational objectives, then it follows that the evaluation of the educational program is the process by which one finds out to what degree these changes are actually taking place in the institutions.

The fourth basic assumption is that human behavior is ordinarily so complex that it cannot be adequately described or measured by a single term or a single dimension. Several aspects or dimensions are usually necessary to describe or measure a particular phase of human behavior.

The fifth assumption is a companion to the fourth. It is assumed that the way in which the student organizes his or her behavioral *pattern* is an important aspect to be appraised. There is the danger, however, that the identification

of various types of behaviors will result in their treatment as isolated bits of action. This is simply a warning that we are not looking for isolated behaviors, but some totality of the way in which the student organizes his or her own behavior.

A sixth basic assumption is that the methods of evaluation are not limited to paper-and-pencil tests. Any device which provides valid evidence regarding the progress of students toward the educational objectives of the program is an appropriate evaluative tool.

A seventh basic assumption is that the nature of appraisal influences both teaching and learning. If students are periodically examined on a certain content, the tendency will be for them to concentrate on that material, even though that content is given little or no emphasis in any book that is studied. Teachers are frequently influenced by their conception of achievement tests. If these tests are thought to emphasize certain points, these points will be emphasized in teaching, even though they are not central to the educational plan as a whole.

An eighth assumption, the last, and perhaps the one which is of most concern to me in talking to you, is that the responsibility for evaluating a program belongs to the staff and to the clientele of a program. In 1942, the way they wrote this was ". . . it was not the duty of the evaluation staff to appraise the school, but rather to help develop means of appraisal and the methods of interpretation."

Other assumptions may be used to establish an evaluation program, but these eight are important because they guided the general procedure which showed the necessity for basing an evaluation program upon educational objectives. The assumptions indicate that educational objectives, or purposes, in evaluation must be stated in terms of changes in the behavior of students. They emphasize the multiple aspects of behavior and the importance of the relationship of various aspects of behavior rather than the treatment of them in isolation.

Tyler goes on to describe the general procedures which are involved in any evaluation. I will simply list the topics that he considers as the general procedures for studying and evaluating students. The first procedure is formulating objectives. Valid educational objectives are not arrived at as a compromise, but rather as a reflection of the demands of society, the characteristics of students, their potential contributions, the social and educational philosophies of the school or college, and the psychology of learning.

The second step is classifying objectives. Objectives have been classified into the cognitive domain and the affective domain. A third step should be the classification of objectives in the psychomotor domain. No one has really put

that together yet; the task is still before us to classify educational objectives which exist in the psychomotor domain, and then begin to show the linkages between the cognitive, the affective, and the psychomotor domains.

The fourth procedure is suggesting situations in which the achievement of objectives will be shown. In what kinds of situations will changes in behavior along these parameters be revealed?

The fifth is selecting and trying promising evaluation methods. I would like to read from the study a passage concerning the fifth procedure, because it may be more relevant to EOPs than to other phases of education, but not necessarily so.

At this time, most of the committees found that no tests were available to measure certain major aspects of the important objectives. In such cases, it was necessary to construct additional new instruments in order to make a really comprehensive appraisal of the educational program in the thirties schools. The nature of the instruments built varied with the types of objectives for which no available instruments were found. Every committee, however, found it helpful when consulting these instruments to set up some of the situations suggested in step four. . . . It is believed to be a recurring process involving the formulation of objectives, their clear definition, plans to study students' reactions in the light of the objectives, and continued efforts to interpret the results . . . in terms of the goals of the educational program and the individual student.

I would like to stop at this point and maybe we could talk a little now in order to clarify my position in terms of what evaluation ought to mean for the appraisal of Educational Opportunity Programs.

A Participant: The Tyler model is an idealistic one. Very few institutions have really evaluated their standard programs. I think the EOPs are always under intensive scrutiny because they do not have the background or the people to support them in the academic community. So, I would think that the evaluation of special programs would perhaps be applied a little differently than the so-called evaluation of the regular programs in the university. I would like you to talk about why we have to evaluate special programs so intensively.

Hugh Lane: I assume that EOP means a process by which students with some set of characteristics that we can eventually be relatively specific about are brought into the system of higher education. Some of these characteristics are human ones that differentiate the EOP students as a group or as a class from the usual student body. One needs to be quite specific about these characteristics, and one needs to talk about the kinds of developmental changes that need to be made in the behaviors of these students. Now, my argument is that if you cannot do this and if you have not gone through this process, not only will you end up with no evaluation, you will also end up with no effect upon learning outcomes. I am suggesting that there is no choice about whether you go through this business of formulating objectives in terms of behavior, because if you haven't, you don't know whether your program is any good anyway.

That's why you have to fall back on attrition studies or matriculation studies, and justify everything in terms of whether people are getting the four-year degree or not. But see, what you've done then is let *their* criteria be the basis for the evaluation of your program.

A Participant: To gain credibility on the campus, you're going to have to use, at least as part of your evaluation design, standard evaluation criteria that are acceptable to the university community. If gaining a degree is an institutional goal, then that should be a major part of the evaluation instrument. There would be other positive variables that might be part of a program evaluation, but I believe that graduation is a major outcome, especially for purposes of refunding.

Hugh Lane: If I pursued this, I would take exactly the opposite position. If indeed you accept those criteria as valid, then why do you have an Educational Opportunity Program? If the goal of the EOP is to select those students who are going to get a four-year degree, then why not simply use the ACT or SAT since we know they work for that purpose?

A Participant: Couldn't you say that a student's behavior has changed if that student didn't achieve well on the ACT in high school but then came to college and started to achieve?

Hugh Lane: Sure, the behavior pattern has changed, but if you start with that as your original objective, your task has just begun. Your next task is to translate the changed behavior into observable behaviors in order to learn whether the changes resulted from an educational effect. You should not be refunded if students' behavior suddenly changes. You should be refunded if changes in students' behavior is a reflection of something you're doing in the program.

Moderator: It appears that we have begun to touch on some things that are threatening.

Hugh Lane: The director of the EOP is a crucial part of the educational process. Some tension is implicit in that assumption. The extent to which the interaction can be carried on from the position of the director of the EOP is also a measure of the extent to which the EOP functions as an integral part of the educational process. In the long run, you have no choice but to wade through this tension in order to clarify a number of relationships which are political, which are faculty-related, and which do affect funding, role, status, and prerogatives on the campus. I believe it is necessary for one to go over this ground.